



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

mourner at his own protracted funeral, a public pageant of gloomy years. Will he not perhaps be remembered as much for the anguish as for the fleeting triumphs of his life? It is a black moment when the heralds proclaim the passing of the dead, and the great officers break their staves. But it is a sadder still when it is the victim's own voice that announces his decadence, when it is the victim's own hands that break the staff in public. I wonder if generations to come will understand the pity of it, will comprehend the full tragedy of Randolph's marred life?"

In April last I wrote a long review of the *Life* for the San Francisco "Argonaut." It went up in smoke before publication, and as I had no notes I did not care to make the doubtful experiment of reconstructing impressions no longer vivid of outline—for it was several months before San Francisco took up any threads with the past again. But I remember making one suggestion, induced by the high and fascinating qualities of this biography, which it may not be amiss to repeat here, and that was that the Disraeli papers be given to Mr. Churchill. I can imagine no one else who would write the life of that complex, bizarre and significant being with one-half the power of insight and style. But it must be soon, or this most significant of living young Englishmen will be too occupied with his own career to sit down again with the past and its dead.

GERTRUDE ATHERTON.

---

"THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE."\*

MR. HAZELTON belongs to that school of historical writers by whom the charm of narrative is necessarily subordinated to the presentation of the results of infinite research and of infinite pains. Each generation produces delightful writers of the narrative school, and every theme will be treated at least once in each generation, the writers of to-morrow superseding the popular writers of to-day. But the school of historians which Bacon proposed calling that of Registers, will live forever. The readers will be few each generation, but for all time the world must go to these patient and not oversought writers for facts and material.

Mr. Hazelton revels in detail. The minutest fact is recorded. Documents are dissected to their last substance. Letters are analyzed in their forgotten elements. Small objects are placed in

\* "The Declaration of Independence: Its History." By John H. Hazelton. New York: Dodd, Mead & Company.

their true relation to large things. Men are brought from obscurity and stationed in the light. Some great characters seem to lessen. And the whole result is the publication, for the first time, of a complete record of the composition and promulgation of the greatest document known to history. We enter a plea for keeping in some few but accessible archives the small things, the fragments, the details of history. Not that these shall always be incorporated in historical accounts of events, but that somewhere we may be assured are preserved all known facts concerning each important event. The dignity of history may not be offended by an unseemly introduction of tables and muniments, but a writer may not ignore their existence or their importance.

The purpose of Mr. Hazelton's book is not to discuss the sentiments of the immortal document, but to give a history of its mechanical construction and promulgation. The outline of the history has often been told.

On June 7, 1776, Richard Henry Lee, a delegate from Virginia, offered a set of three resolutions, the holograph original of which is still preserved in the Library of Congress and a photograph of which is exhibited in Independence Hall at Philadelphia. The first of these resolutions is as follows:

"Resolved, That these United Colonies are and of right ought to be free and independent states, that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British Crown, and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

This resolution in its exact form was adopted on July 2, 1776. It constituted the real Act of Independence. It was the formal decree of separation. The words "declare" or "Declaration" do not appear in this resolution. The announcement or declaration of this Act was passed on July 4, 1776, and it is this Declaration and not the Act of Independence of which we here have the detailed history. If no formal declaration had been adopted, the political connection between the Colonies and the state of Great Britain would already have stood dissolved. Yet no one seems interested in Richard Henry Lee, the author and introducer of the Resolution of Separation. No one inquires when or where he wrote it. That the delegates themselves understood the significance of Lee's resolution is apparent from the letter John Adams wrote his wife and dated July 3, 1776, saying: "Yes-

terday the greatest Question was decided which ever was debated in America, and a greater perhaps never was or will be decided among men. . . . The second day of July, 1776, will be the most memorable Epocha in the history of America. I am apt to believe that it will be celebrated by succeeding Generations as the great anniversary Festival."

Perhaps it would save confusion in the minds of young students if we referred to the transaction of July 2, 1776, as the Act of Independence, and to the transaction of July 4 as the Declaration of Independence.

Mr. Lee's resolution was referred, on June 11, to a Committee of Five—Mr. Jefferson, Mr. John Adams, Mr. Franklin, Mr. Sherman and Mr. R. R. Livingston. Thus the Colonies of Virginia, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Connecticut and New York were represented. The mover of the resolution, Mr. Lee, by parliamentary usage should have been named upon this Committee. John Adams says that Lee was not beloved of his colleagues, and that jealousy partly accounts for the neglect to make him a member. He also says that another reason for his name not appearing in the list of five is that his original resolution in its third paragraph called for the preparation of a plan of Confederation, and that Mr. Lee had been placed on a Committee to prepare this plan. Mr. Adams is mistaken. Mr. Lee did not leave Philadelphia until June 13, and the Committee to prepare the plan of Confederation was appointed June 12, and instead of naming Lee his colleague Nelson represented Virginia.

There is nothing in the Lee resolution calling for a Declaration. It was proper, however, and it was the habit of the Congress to explain its acts. The Committee of Five requested Jefferson to draft the articles of Declaration. Adams declares he insisted that Jefferson should do the actual composition because of the opinion he held of his facile pen.

The Declaration was written in rooms on the second floor of a house in Philadelphia situated at the southwest corner of Market and Seventh streets, which was demolished only in 1883. The identical desk on which it was composed is preserved in the Library of the Department of State. What is bibliographically known as the Rough-draft of the Declaration, after having been submitted to Adams and Franklin, by whom a few changes were suggested, was reported by the Committee of Five to the Congress

on Friday, June 28, when it was laid upon the table, that body adjourning until Monday, July 1. On July 3 the Congress resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the Declaration, continuing its session to the following day, when it was again considered, reported favorably to the Congress in the evening and passed. During the night or early on the morning of July 5, the printer Dunlap furnished a copy in type and in the form of a somewhat irregularly cut broadside measuring 478 millimètres high by 380 millimètres broad, and the Secretary, Charles Thompson, inserted this in his original Journal. This printed form is the official Declaration of Independence. On July 19 the secret Journal records that the Declaration was ordered engrossed and, when completed, signed by all the members of the Congress. On August 2 the Declaration, engrossed on parchment, was laid before the Congress and signed by those present. Sentimental interest centres around the engrossed or parchment copy. Franklin, on July 4, 1786, John Adams, on February 2, 1814, and Jefferson, on May 12, 1819, all asserted that the Declaration was signed on July 4, 1776. Trumbull perpetuated this error in his picture commemorative of that day. The artist actually represents the Committee of Five in the act of presenting its report to the Congress. The brush can be as inaccurate as the pen and doubly as persuasive. Neither the Rough-draft (except probably by Hancock as President and Charles Thompson as Secretary) nor the printed document was signed by the fifty-six delegates on July 4 or at any other time. Nor were all of the delegates who, on and after August 2, 1776, signed the parchment document, members of the Congress on July 2 and 4. We do not know when some of them signed. Thornton did not enter the Congress until November 4, 1776. Dickinson, Willing and Humphreys did not sign. Clinton, Alsop and Wisner never signed. Although present on the passing of both the Act and the Declaration, the New York delegates refrained from voting, awaiting instructions from their Provincial Congress. When this body met at White Plains, on July 9, 1776, it approved of the Declaration, and in due time four of the delegates from this State, Philip Livingston, Floyd, Lewis Morris and Lewis appended their names. Thus, although its representatives in the Congress failed to vote on the great Act of Independence and its subsequent Declaration, New York was the first of the Colonies to have its parlia-

mentary representatives, fresh from the people, approve and ratify the proceedings of the Congress. Of all the delegates in Philadelphia, none did more for the revolutionary cause than Henry Wisner of New York. He accomplished what all the patriotic resolves in the world could not have accomplished. It was he who erected powder-mills, and united sulphur and charcoal and saltpetre into those explosive arguments which won for us victory and peace. New York has erected to him no monument, and few even recall his name.

McKean, Gerry, Wolcott, Lewis Morris, R. H. Lee, Stockton and Wythe were not present on August 2, 1776. Paine and Heyward were probably also absent on that day. It is worthy of notice that of the signers Ross, Clymer, Rush, Smith and Taylor of Pennsylvania were not elected to the Congress until July 20, 1776.

Ross had been chosen to the first and second Congresses, but had not taken his seat in the latter.

The scope and space of this article do not permit an inquiry into the originality of the sentiments uttered in the Declaration or of the forms of expression employed by Jefferson. Both were of an elevated kind, but not entirely unfamiliar. There never has been a time, no matter what freedom he has enjoyed, when man has not talked of liberty. The consciousness and immediateness of political wrongs have produced the most lofty tones of complaint. Before Jefferson spoke others had talked of Princes who were tyrants and of rights which were inalienable. But the individual is irresponsible. Here the world beheld an entire people breaking ties which bound them to a most powerful state and boldly assuming the name, prerogatives and responsibilities of a nation.

The act meant blood and war and years of darkness. And whether we regard the Act of Independence of July 2, 1776, or the Declaration of Independence of July 4, 1776, we must first hold ourselves in the hush of reverence and then discharge our emotions in cries of joy. The problems are not yet all solved. The fruits of liberty are not yet all gathered. But that the former will be settled here, and that the ripest and most perfect fruit will be grown upon our soil is the hope and belief of every American.

JOHN BOYD THACHER.